

G670

1908

C7F5

Fields, Hon. Wm. J.

"North Pole Controversy"

1915

Hollinger
pH 8.5
Mill Run F03-2193

NORTH POLE CONTROVERSY

[Public—No. 487.]

An act (S. 6104) providing for the promotion of Civil Engineer Robert E. Peary, United States Navy, and tendering to him the thanks of Congress.

SEC. 2. That the thanks of Congress be, and the same are hereby, tendered to Robert E. Peary, United States Navy, for his Arctic explorations resulting in reaching the North Pole.

Approved, March 4, 1911.

It will be noticed that the above resolution does not accredit Mr. Peary with having discovered the North Pole, but with having reached the North Pole. Therefore the resolution does not recognize Mr. Peary as the discoverer of the pole, nor does it preclude Dr. Cook's claim that he discovered the pole on April 21, 1908, which was more than 11 months before Mr. Peary reached the pole according to the date given by Peary himself, which was April 6, 1909.

Then, if one American citizen should receive congressional recognition for Arctic achievements, why should not another American citizen receive the same recognition and the same thanks if he can establish to the satisfaction of Congress that he attained the same achievement, and attained it many months prior to the date that Mr. Peary claims to have done so. Dr. Cook announced to the world that he had reached the North Pole prior to the announcement of Mr. Peary that he had done so, and was the first citizen of his own or any other country to claim to have reached that long-sought goal. Dr. Cook says he will establish by expert testimony, if given an opportunity, his claim of priority in reaching the pole. He states that more than 60 Arctic explorers and scientific experts from different parts of the world have recognized him as the discoverer of the pole, and that not one Arctic explorer or scientific expert has disputed same on scientific grounds.

REMARKS OF HON. WILLIAM J. FIELDS OF KENTUCKY

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FEBRUARY 8, 1915

WASHINGTON
1915

82300—14576



2-2-10
G 6670
1908
C 715

REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. FIELDS.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the Record I desire to submit a few brief observations, together with a letter from Dr. Frederick A. Cook to the Congress of the United States and certain other data bearing upon the polar controversy between Dr. Cook and Civil Engineer Robert E. Peary, both of whom claim to have reached the North Pole, and I trust that same, especially the letter of Dr. Cook, may receive the careful attention of the membership of the House.

I desire to say first that I am not prompted by personal interest in Dr. Cook or by unkind feelings toward Mr. Peary to speak upon this subject. I have only the slightest acquaintance with the former and have never met the latter. I therefore disclaim any personal interest in the controversy or personal preference for either gentleman. I am, however, interested in seeing each of these gentlemen receive fair treatment and a square deal at the hands of the American Congress and the American people in this controversy, which is no more than each and every American is entitled to in any matter with which the Congress has to do or in which the people are interested. I assume that the Congress is interested in this matter for the reason that it did by act of Congress tender the thanks of Congress to Mr. Peary for reaching the North Pole, which will be found in Public, No. 487, S. 6104, which reads as follows:

[Public—No. 487.]

An act (S. 6104) providing for the promotion of Civil Engineer Robert E. Peary, United States Navy, and tendering to him the thanks of Congress.

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to place Civil Engineer Robert E. Peary, United States Navy, on the retired list of the Corps of Civil Engineers with the rank of rear admiral, to date from April 6, 1909, with the highest retired pay of that grade under existing law.

SEC. 2. That the thanks of Congress be, and the same are hereby, tendered to Robert E. Peary, United States Navy, for his Arctic explorations resulting in reaching the North Pole.

Approved, March 4, 1911.

It will be noticed that the above resolution does not accredit Mr. Peary with having discovered the North Pole, but with having reached the North Pole. Therefore the resolution does not recognize Mr. Peary as the discoverer of the pole, nor does it preclude Dr. Cook's claim that he discovered the pole on April 21, 1908, which was more than 11 months before Mr. Peary reached the pole according to the date given by Peary himself, which was April 6, 1909.

I am informed that some gentlemen have said on the floor of this House that Congress is not concerned about this matter, and that it has no jurisdiction over same. In reply to this

statement I desire to ask, If Congress is not concerned about this matter, why, then, did it tender its thanks to Mr. Peary for his polar attainment? Nor did it stop at a vote of thanks, but by the same resolution it granted him a pension at \$6,000 per annum for the remainder of his life, and by other governmental action he has been paid many thousand dollars out of the Public Treasury during his various leaves of absence from the naval service, much of which time was spent in polar explorations. This enormous sum, the thanks of Congress for his polar attainment, and the pension granted him was an admission and an implied acknowledgment on the part of the Congress of its interest in, and jurisdiction over, the polar efforts and achievements or controversies of American citizens.

It can not be argued in either justice or sincerity that Mr. Peary should receive the special favors of Congress for his polar attainment because he happened to be fortunate enough to be in the United States Navy. First, no man would dare contend that a naval officer should be given special advantages over a private citizen in a civil pursuit which was not a part of his official duty, and, second, the recommendation of the Secretary of the Navy on the resolution which acknowledged Mr. Peary's claim for Arctic explorations recommends that he is not entitled to such recognition for naval services, but throws him solely upon his claim as a private citizen for Arctic explorations. I submit copy of the report of the Secretary of the Navy, just referred to, which reads as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, February 10, 1910.

To the CHAIRMAN COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The receipt is acknowledged of your letter of the 8th instant, inclosing a bill (H. R. 19971) providing for the appointment of Commander Robert E. Peary a rear admiral in the Navy as an additional number in grade, and placing him upon the retired list, and requesting for the committee the views and recommendations of the department thereon.

In reply I have the honor to inform you that Robert Edwin Peary entered the naval service of the United States as a civil engineer on October 26, 1881, and has been an officer of the Navy continuously since that date, performing the duties required of a civil engineer under orders from the Navy Department, except when on leave.

During his service in the Navy Civil Engineer Peary has been granted leave of absence abroad as follows:

April 6, 1886, leave abroad, 8 months.
October 31, 1887, leave abroad, 12 months.
February 24, 1891, leave abroad, 18 months.
November 21, 1892, leave abroad, 3 years.
May 2, 1896, leave abroad, 6 months.
May 25, 1897, leave abroad, 5 months.
September 9, 1903, leave abroad, 3 years.
April 9, 1907, leave abroad, 3 years.

The unexpired portion of this last leave was revoked on July 2, 1908, and Civil Engineer Peary was ordered to report to the Coast and Geodetic Survey for duty in making tidal observations in Grant Land and Greenland.

It would appear that the bill in question is framed for the purpose of rewarding Civil Engineer Peary for having reached the North Pole; and while having successfully accomplished this self-imposed task is most commendable and reflects great credit not only upon him but also upon the entire Nation, his various exploring expeditions can not be regarded as having been conducted for a strictly military or naval purpose, and for this reason it seems inappropriate to confer upon him a title for which his previous education, training, and service have not fitted him.

It is therefore recommended that in the title of the bill and in the fourth line thereof the word "commander" be changed to "civil

engineer," the latter being Mr. Peary's correct official designation, and, further, that instead of appointing him a rear admiral and placing him upon the retired list as such, that he be retired as a civil engineer, with the rank of rear admiral, and with the highest retired pay of that grade under existing law.

Faithfully, yours,

G. VON L. MEYER.

Then, if one American citizen should receive congressional recognition for Arctic achievements, why should not another American citizen receive the same recognition and the same thanks if he can establish to the satisfaction of Congress that he attained the same achievement, and attained it many months prior to the date that Mr. Peary claims to have done so. Dr. Cook announced to the world that he had reached the North Pole prior to the announcement of Mr. Peary that he had done so, and was the first citizen of his own or any other country to claim to have reached that long-sought goal. Dr. Cook says he will establish by expert testimony, if given an opportunity, his claim of priority in reaching the pole. He states that more than 60 Arctic explorers and scientific experts from different parts of the world have recognized him as the discoverer of the pole, and that not one Arctic explorer or scientific expert has disputed same on scientific grounds, and that he is in possession of documents proving this acknowledgment; and these documents were written after the publication of the polar records of both himself and Peary, and most of them were written during the year 1914, after a most careful study had been made of the reports of both himself and Peary. So, in view of the claim of Dr. Cook that each and all Arctic explorers who have spoken on the controversy recognize him as the discoverer of the pole, it is, in my opinion, incumbent upon Congress to accord to him the same treatment that it accorded to Mr. Peary. It should give him an opportunity to establish his claim of priority by giving him and his witnesses a hearing before a committee of Congress; and if, after a thorough hearing that committee is convinced that Dr. Cook did reach the pole, he should then receive national recognition through the Congress of the United States, which would automatically establish his claim of priority, as there is no controversy between Cook and Peary as to the date that each claims to have reached the pole. He is an American citizen the same as Peary, and should receive equal treatment at the hands of the American Congress. Justice demands that he be granted a hearing by the same Congress that gave Peary recognition, and a just public sentiment will sooner or later force such a hearing; and it is my contention that it should not be delayed, but should be granted while the expert witnesses who are familiar with the data and the facts and who are capable of passing upon same and giving competent testimony are obtainable. And in this connection I make the contention that the weight of expert computations on the observations of both Cook and Peary is in favor of Cook. As a basis of Peary's claim in this regard I submit copy of a letter of Hon. O. H. Tittmann, Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, which reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
UNITED STATES COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY,
Washington, March 4, 1914.

MR. E. N. NORTON,
6952 Harvard Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

SIR: In reply to your letter of February 28, 1914, I have to inform you that you can obtain information in regard to observations, etc., of
82300—14576

Admiral Peary on his trip to the far north in his book called "Peary's North Pole."

You will find a statement of the testimony of Hugh C. Mitchell, one of the computers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, who worked up Peary's observations, on pages 135-142 of the hearings before the Committee on Naval Affairs, subcommittee on private bills, dated March 4, 1910, a copy of which can probably be obtained by writing to the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

The computations of Peary's work were made by Messrs. Hugh C. Mitchell and Charles R. Duvall, who were employed for the purpose by Mr. Peary. These computations were, therefore, not made officially by the Coast and Geodetic Survey, although this office has always vouched for the accuracy of the work done by these two men.

Respectfully,

O. H. TITTMANN, *Superintendent.*

It will be noted from the above letter that the observations of Mr. Peary were computed by only two gentlemen who were connected with the Coast and Geodetic Survey, but who were not acting officially in their computations of Peary's observations but were paid for same by Mr. Peary himself. I do not question the integrity of these gentlemen or the correctness of their computations of Peary's observations, but in connection with their report I wish to call attention to the fact that the observations of Dr. Cook were computed by Mr. Clark Brown, associate member of the American Society of Civil Engineers, and Mr. Brown's computations were approved by David R. Lee, civil engineer, B. S., Cornell University, 1889, also a member of the American Society of Civil Engineers; J. M. Taylor, M. E., Cornell University, 1888; E. G. Raynor, civil engineer, B. S., New York University, 1903; R. C. Holt, civil engineer; and J. C. Green, associate member American Society of Civil Engineers, Michigan Agricultural College, 1901. All five of these gentlemen are scientific experts from different parts of the country, and four of them were not then and are not now acquainted with Dr. Cook. Therefore if we accept the report of the two scientific experts who computed the observations of Mr. Peary, we should also accept the report of the five scientific experts who computed the observations of Dr. Cook, and who show by their computations that Cook reached the pole.

Not only do the principles of justice demand that Dr. Cook be given a hearing and that this controversy be settled for all time, but our educational interests demand its settlement. The students of history of the present and future are entitled to have the controversy settled while the claimants are both living and each able to defend his case, so that they may not be misled by history or left to guess at the facts.

Then there is another reason why an investigation of this matter should be made by Congress. Congress has officially acknowledged that Mr. Peary reached the pole. I am informed that it is now contended that he did not reach the pole, and that it can be established that he did not if opportunity is given. I do not attempt to vouch for the truthfulness of that statement or the soundness of the contention. But I do contend that Congress was not indulging in child's play or idle formalities in its official recognition of Mr. Peary's claim that he reached the pole. It was dealing with a question of both national and international interest and should be sure of the grounds upon which it based its action. I understand that it was stated by Miss Lillian E. Keil, former stenographer for Hampton's Magazine, before the Committee on Education of this House a few days

ago that the alleged Peary report of his trip to the pole was not a product of his own brain, but was a product of the editorial staff of Hampton's Magazine. If this be true, it is sufficient to raise the question of doubt as to whether the report was written on information and calculations received from Mr. Peary, or on information from some other source. It is therefore the duty of Congress to inquire into the authenticity of the report on which it gave Peary recognition. If the charges advanced by Miss Kiel are untrue, they are an injustice to Mr. Peary and the editorial staff and the magazine referred to, and their truthfulness should be immediately challenged and disproved by Mr. Peary and all other parties concerned. If they are true, Mr. Peary and his staff have done an injustice to both the Congress and the public by leaving this matter open to so much doubt. As a basis of my reference to the charges of Miss Kiel before the Committee on Education of the House of Representatives, I here submit copy of an affidavit by her containing practically the same charges above referred to, which reads as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 1, 1914.

To whom it may concern:

While employed as editorial stenographer by Hampton's Magazine it fell to my lot to take the story entitled "The Discovery of the North Pole," which ran in Hampton's in 1910. This story was published over the name of Robert E. Peary, was dictated to me by a woman—Mrs. Elsa Barker—and of it Mr. Peary wrote not one word. I still hold in my possession my stenographer's notebooks containing my original shorthand notes of this story.

Later in the year a member of this same enterprising, unscrupulous editorial staff manufactured and dictated to me a faked "statement" for the press to which I was commanded to sign the name "Frederick A. Cook" by typewriter, but of which Dr. Cook had absolutely no knowledge until it appeared in the public press.

This faked "statement"—commonly called "the Cook confession"—appeared simultaneously with the issue of Hampton's Magazine for January, 1911, which contained the first instalment of what was known as "Dr. Cook's own story," in which, after Dr. Cook had O. K.'d the galley proofs, I helped to insert certain insanity and "confession" clauses.

The above is a voluntary statement made by me in the interests of justice without the knowledge of Dr. Frederick A. Cook.

LILIAN E. KIEL.

CITY OF WASHINGTON, District of Columbia, ss:

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 1st day of July, 1914.

[SEAL.]

E. C. OWEN, Notary Public.

I maintain that if the charges made by Miss Kiel are untrue, Mr. Peary and those implicated with him by these charges can not afford to sit idly by and let them go unnoticed or unchallenged. And if the charges of Miss Kiel are not refuted or met by a satisfactory explanation, the Congress and the country must admit that a mistake was made by giving Mr. Peary congressional recognition for his polar achievements, the report in question being a part of the basis upon which they gave such recognition. And, further still, Dr. Cook is heralding charges against Mr. Peary from one end of the United States to the other, so grave in character that they are inflaming the public mind to such an extent that the public is contending that inasmuch as Congress has impliedly acknowledged its jurisdiction over this matter by its recognition of the Arctic achievements of Mr. Peary, it is now incumbent upon Congress to make a full and thorough investigation of the claims of Dr. Cook and the

82300—14576

charges by him against Mr. Peary, charging the latter with bribery, fraud, and falsehoods, to discredit and destroy him (Cook) and establish his (Peary's) polar claim, upon which claim he received congressional recognition.

The public is contending that the charges which Cook is making against Peary should be answered and refuted or acknowledged by Mr. Peary. I would not make any contention for the purpose of precipitating further controversy between the two gentlemen under discussion, but I do contend that Congress should take the matter in hand and should give a full and open hearing to both claimants and their witnesses. If the charges are untrue, the country should know it, and Cook's campaign against Peary should come to an end. If, on the other hand, they are true, the country, and especially the Congress, which gave official recognition to Mr. Peary, should know it. I maintain that neither Mr. Peary nor the Congress which has officially recognized him should be willing to permit the campaign of Dr. Cook to further proceed without notice. It is my opinion and my contention that the controversy should be settled and settled right. And in the hope that it may lead to that end I am introducing the following resolution:

Be it resolved, etc., That the thanks of Congress be, and the same are hereby, tendered to Dr. Frederick A. Cook for his Arctic explorations, resulting in his reaching the North Pole.

This resolution is practically identical with section 2 of the resolution extending the thanks of Congress to Mr. Peary, and if it should be passed by Congress it will automatically settle the question of priority of discovery in favor of Dr. Cook. I introduce this resolution in the hope that it may lead to a full hearing and proper and final settlement of the question in controversy. The controversy should be settled, to the end that if Cook's claim of discovery of the North Pole and his charges against Peary are untrue, the country should know it and his campaign of assault upon Peary should cease. On the other hand, if he can establish his claim that he reached the North Pole, as he says he can, and as the great number of Arctic explorers and scientists say he can, he should not only be recognized by the Congress and the country as the discoverer of the North Pole, but should be commended by the world for the brave, fearless, and untiring fight which he has waged for his rights.

I include in the data submitted herewith copy of the contract between Mr. Peary and the New York Times, which was printed in the Times on September 11, 1909. I also include copies of numerous letters from Arctic explorers and scientific experts to which I invite special attention: and I desire to say here that I have seen all the original letters from which these copies are made. I submit all this together with Dr. Cook's letter to the Congress of the United States to which I have previously referred, for the information of the membership of the House. And I insist that in view of the preponderance of evidence in favor of the claim of priority at the North Pole by Dr. Cook, and his request for and persistent efforts to secure a hearing before Congress, the same body that heard Mr. Peary, a hearing should be granted to Cook.

The data above referred to is submitted in the following order:

TIMES CONTRACT WITH PEARY AS PUBLISHED IN NEW YORK TIMES
SEPTEMBER 11, 1909.

NEW YORK TIMES,
New York City, July 6, 1908.

GENTLEMEN: I herewith acknowledge the receipt of the sum of \$4,000 from the New York Times on behalf of itself and associates. It is understood that in making this advance the Times does not assume any responsibility for or any connection with the expedition on which I am about to embark, and which has for its purpose the finding of the North Pole. The money is advanced to me as a loan to be repaid to the New York Times and its associates out of the proceeds of the news and literary rights resulting from this expedition, it being understood that if for any reason the expedition is abandoned before the fall of 1908 the money is to be refunded to the Times. If the expedition is successful and the pole is discovered I promise to use every means in my power to reach civilization and wire to the Times the full story of the discovery over my own signature. The Times is to have the sole rights to the news of the discovery, and is to have the exclusive right of its publication in all parts of the world. My understanding is that the Times, on its part, agrees to syndicate the news both in Europe and America, and to give to me the entire amount it receives, after deducting costs of cables, tolls, etc. The Times and its associates will pay me what they consider a reasonable amount for the use of the material in their own publications. From the sum thus raised the \$4,000 is to be repaid, and I am free to sell the magazine and book rights to my best advantage.

It is understood, however, that should the news reports by any possibility not realize the sum of \$4,000, any deficit will be reimbursed to the Times from the magazine and book rights.

Should the expedition not be successful in finding the pole, but should simply result in explorations in the Far North, the Times is to be repaid \$4,000 out of the news, magazine, and book rights of the expedition, so far as they may go toward the liquidation of that claim.

Yours, very truly,

R. E. PEARY.

[Editorial comment from the Evening Tribune, Des Moines, Iowa, June 23, 1914.]

Whatever else Dr. Cook may be right or wrong about, he is most certainly right about the efforts that are being made to suppress him and his contentions over the North Pole discovery.

The Evening Tribune is in receipt of a mass of printed matter about the doctor, sent from no acknowledged source, that in the preparation must represent weeks of labor and hundreds of dollars' expense.

The question that naturally suggests itself is why such an effort should now be considered necessary to discredit the doctor, and who is financially interested enough to go to the expense?

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 7, 1911.

To Dr. FREDERICK A. COOK,
New York City.

DEAR DR. COOK: I thank you very much for your kind letter, and I assure you that I have never varied in the belief that you and Civil Engineer Peary reached the pole. After reading the published accounts daily and critically of both claimants, I was forced to the conclusion from their striking similarity that each of you was the eye-witness of the other's success.

Without collusion it would have been impossible to have written accounts so similar, and yet in view of the ungracious controversy that has occurred since that view (collusion) would be impossible to imagine.

While I have never believed that either of you got within a pin point of the pole, I have steadfastly held that both got as near the goal as was possible to ascertain, considering the imperfections of the instruments used and the personal errors of individuals under circumstances so adverse to absolute accuracy.

Again, I have been broad enough in my views to believe that there was room enough at the pole for two, and never narrow enough to believe that only one man got there.

I believe that both are entitled to the honor of the achievement.

Very truly, yours,

W. S. SCHLEY.

82300—14576

INDORSEMENTS OF LETTER BY ADMIRAL SCHLEY, JANUARY 7, 1911.

SAN JOSE, CAL., April 22, 1914.

I agree with Admiral Schley and have drawn my conclusions from like reasoning.

MAURICE CONNELL.

(Maurice Connell, connected with United States Weather Bureau and member of the Greely Arctic Expedition.)

COPY OF INSCRIPTION ON BACK OF PHOTOGRAPH PRESENTED TO DR. COOK BY DR. J. G. KNOWLTON, SURGEON TO THE "NEPTUNE," SCOTT EXPEDITION.

For Dr. Frederick A. Cook, the first man at the North Pole, and I may say, the only one up to date.
From his friend,

Dr. J. G. KNOWLTON,
Surgeon to Steamer "Neptune," Scott Expedition.

JANUARY 19, 1914.

COPY OF INDORSEMENT ON SCHLEY LETTER.

PORT ARTHUR, CANADA.

I am of the same opinion as Admiral W. S. Schley, that Frederick A. Cook was the first to reach the North Pole.

JOHN E. NEWSOME,
(Ten years in the Arctic.)

COPY OF INDORSEMENT ON ADMIRAL SCHLEY'S LETTER TO DR. COOK.

After careful consideration of Rear Admiral Schley's Arctic letters to Dr. Cook, I don't hesitate to indorse every word the admiral said of the doctor.

JOHN BYERS WIRT,
Commodore Commanding National Naval Veterans, U. S. of A.

On a copy of the late Rear Admiral W. S. Schley's letter of indorsement to Dr. Cook, Capt. J. E. Bernier wrote as follows:

This is my opinion.

J. E. BERNIER,
Leader of Various Official Canadian Arctic Expeditions.

CANADA, January 19, 1914.

COPY OF INDORSEMENT ON SCHLEY LETTER.

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 3, 1914.

I indorse fully the foregoing letter of Rear Admiral W. S. Schley to Dr. Frederick A. Cook, of date January 7, 1911, so far as it refers to Dr. Cook's achievement.

MIDDLETON SMITH,
Observer and Naturalist, Point Barrow Expedition.

COPY OF INDORSEMENT ON SCHLEY LETTER.

This is the way I have always looked at it.

SAMUEL J. ENTRIQUIN,
Second in Command of the Peary Expedition of 1894.

MARCH 13, 1914.

COPY OF INDORSEMENT ON SCHLEY LETTER.

APRIL 22, 1914.

MY DEAR DR. COOK: I indorsed these sentiments at the time they were first expressed, and have discovered no reasons in the intervening years to change my opinion.

Sincerely,
SAMUEL P. ORTH,
Professor of Political Economy, Cornell University, New York,
Member of the "Miranda" Arctic Expedition, 1894.

COPY OF INDORSEMENT ON SCHLEY LETTER.

NEW YORK CITY, January 23, 1914.

The opinion of Admiral Schley is my belief regarding the rival polar claims.

EDWIN S. BROOKE, JR.,
Crocker Land Expedition, 1913.

To the Congress of the United States (presented through ———):

As an American citizen, I ask Congress to act upon the Poindexter joint resolution 144, which was introduced April 30, 1914, or any other that may have been introduced later, to the end that we Americans may have the right to say that an American was the first to reach the geographical spot known as the North Pole, for which statement at the present time no authority exists.

The question of who discovered the North Pole is in doubt in the minds of many people the world over. It is a question that should be settled and settled right; and it would seem that now is the fitting time to do it, while both claimants are alive, and evidence, such as there is, available.

Many people in Europe, and multitudes in the United States, are thoroughly convinced that Dr. Frederick A. Cook was the first man to reach 90° north latitude.

As time passes and citizens of this country read the story of the conquest of the pole as told by Dr. Cook in his book entitled, "My Attainment of the Pole," or listen to him personally as he tells his experiences from the lecture platform, it is borne in upon them that there has been a great injustice done, and that the popular belief that R. E. Peary is the discoverer of the North Pole is erroneous.

To my mind, the chief proof that an explorer can give of what he claims to have accomplished is to be found in his account or narrative. We like that to ring true and to tally with such facts as we know. Dr. Cook in his book, "My Attainment of the Pole," gives us a story that does ring true, and his claim that he was the first of all men to reach the North Pole is, I think, proven beyond question. The story of its conquest and of the wonderful journey over the ice floes with his two Eskimo companions is most convincing.

The record of observations by sextant for latitude made by Dr. Cook are as good, I believe, as possible to be taken under such adverse conditions as must prevail in the vicinity of the pole. The novel idea of proving his position by accurate and painstaking observations of shadows for a period of 24 hours while at the pole was a happy thought, and such results as he got would obtain nowhere else but at the North or South Poles.

Should further proof be needed, it is to be found in the reports given by R. E. Peary in his book, entitled the "North Pole," written some time after Dr. Cook's statements had been made public. In this book Mr. Peary, writing of his journey to the pole, describes in detail the same conditions of ice, water, and sky that Dr. Cook found the year before; also where Dr. Cook saw land to the west, first between the eighty-fourth and eighty-fifth parallels of north latitude, and later the submerged island between the eighty-seventh and eighty-eighth parallels, Peary, too far east to possibly see these lands, yet found the divisions in the floes caused by the obstruction of those lands to the easterly drift of the ice. He also, in one case at least, reported animal life, indicating that land could not be too far away.

There are probably but few people who doubt that R. E. Peary reached the pole in 1909; but if so, how are we to account for his description of that journey, tallying so completely with that previously given to the public by Dr. Cook, unless we admit that Dr. Cook must have made the same journey the year before, as he says he did?

To those of us who know Dr. Cook, his simple word is sufficient; to those who do not, his word should be as good as another's.

I believe that anyone who has had much experience in the Arctic regions and who is familiar with the narratives of both Dr. Cook and R. E. Peary, and who is honest and unprejudiced, must feel that the honor of discovering the North Pole belongs by right to Dr. Frederick A. Cook.

Unfortunately, it would seem that as a rule the press of this country love sensation better than truth, and have been most ready to print charges of fake and fraud as advanced by Peary and his followers, while their columns have been closed to Dr. Cook when he has wished to answer these charges and present his own claims.

The people of the United States, however, love truth and justice, and I think it would be peculiarly fitting for the Congress of the United States to investigate this matter impartially and settle for all time as to whom belongs the honor of discovering the North Pole. I ask that in the interest of national honor, justice, and geographical and historical knowledge.

Respectfully,

EDWARD A. HAYEN,
Master Mariner.

(Served as officer in navigating and handling ships in Arctic ice for 14 years; the last voyage as first officer with the Ziegler polar expedition 82300—14576)

tion of 1903-1905. Also three years' experience sledging and boat sailing on Alaskan rivers and coasts.)

OAKLAND, CAL., December 28, 1914.

UNITED STATES REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE,
454 Piedmont Avenue, Oakland, Cal.,
April 27, 1914.

Mr. E. C. ROST,
6552 Harvard Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR SIR: I wish to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 15th instant in regard to the work of the Arctic explorers, Dr. Frederick A. Cook, of Brooklyn, N. Y., and Civil Engineer Robert E. Peary, United States Navy, retired, inclosing a copy of a letter to Dr. Cook from the late Admiral W. S. Schley, United States Navy, which I return you herewith.

You ask me for my opinion as to the merit of the claims for discovery of the geographical point, the North Pole, and in reply I wish to state that I have met both the persons referred to, have carefully studied their reports, and from the experience I have had during five cruises to the Arctic Ocean on the Pacific side in Government ships I fully indorse the view of the late Admiral Schley in his letter to Dr. Cook in every particular, and I regret very much that any public controversy ever took place between the two gentlemen after the hardship and snifering they so bravely had endured for the sake of national pride and science. The priority of discovery evidently belongs to Dr. Cook.

I am, sir, very truly, yours,

O. C. HAMLET,
Senior Captain U. S. Revenue-Cutter Service, retired.

STRANDBOULEVARD 114,
KOBENHAVN.

MY DEAR DR. COOK: It is very kind of you, indeed, to send me the photos of yourself and those from the voyage. I do appreciate them very much, and prize them highly amongst the other explorers. Once more, please accept my most sincere thanks.

May I congratulate you? I saw in the papers that the Congress was going to confer an honor on you. I need not tell you that I was very pleased.

I have from our mutual friend, Hamlet, received the congressional report on the Peary investigation, and was extremely interested. Good God! That committee of the National Geographic Society have certainly taken matters easy. It seems really incredible. If a similar report from the Congress have been sent out, I would be very pleased to receive it.

I am angry with Peary, as I have written and written again regarding some glaciological work done on the ice cap on Greenland, but have never received an answer, and I presume that he does not like that I brought back the information that the Peary Channel did not exist. That's the only reason that I can find out.

Do tell me, are there in your "Through the First Antarctic Night" any glaciological information, or have you written anything on this theme, for instance, from your Mount McKinley voyage? I am working hard with it, as I have to draw up my official report over the voyage across the northern Greenlandic ice cap. Did I ever send you my book? If not, let me know, and I will send it to you at once, and if you care for my photo I would be honored to send you one.

What definite information is there in Peary's book about his having reached the pole? Has he written anything?

With my kindest regards and thanks, I am,

Yours, faithfully,

EJNAR MIKKELSEN,
Leader Arctic Expedition to Bering Sea, Member Ziegler
Arctic Expedition, Leader Erickson Relief Expedition.

DURBAN, April 24, 1914.

Dr. F. A. Cook.

DEAR SIR: Most sincere thanks for your excellent book, My Attainment of the North Pole.

I've read it with the greatest interest, and I must congratulate you as the winner of the blue ribbon. By the way, permit me to tell you that I've always been one of your most ardent supporters, even in those

days when the Peary gang had the run of the press and you were silent. Amongst those who have had a peep behind the curtains of Arctic exploration Peary's true character is only too well known to be commended upon and his doings are the least said infamous.

You have fought a noble fight with a true gentleman's weapon, which is more than what can be said about your antagonist, and I sincerely hope that the justice you are demanding shall not be long in forthcoming.

Hoping to have the pleasure of one day making your personal acquaintance, I beg to remain,

Sincerely, yours,

R. BERGENDAHL.
Of the Ziegler Expedition.

Address, Warberg, Sweden.

SCHOONER "CARRIE W. BABSON,"
709 Cleveland Street, Tampa, Fla., May 23, 1914.

Dr. F. A. COOK, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR DOCTOR: It was with much pleasure that I received your book, *My Attainment of the Pole*, on my arrival here from sea.

Please accept my sincere thanks for your kind remembrance, and rest assured I shall keep it as a token of the first discoverer of the North Pole.

I have sent a card in your behalf to our Congressman SPARKMAN.

Thanking you kindly once more, hoping this finds all well.

Yours, sincerely,

Capt. JOHN MARSHALL.

P. S.—You will remember the schooner *C. W. Babson*, of Gloucester, Mass. I have sailed her for the past eight years in the Central American trade.

CHICAGO, ILL., September 14, 1914.

To whom it may concern:

During a luncheon at the New Washington Hotel, in Seattle, Wash., Wednesday, January 8, 1913, when Capt. Otto Sverdrup, his daughter, Dr. Frederick A. Cook, and myself were present, the captain said: "Dr. Cook, I have always taken a great deal of interest in your polar explorations on account of my own work in the Arctic. I have read your narrative carefully, and by the indisputable facts contained therein I am confident that you reached the North Pole."

G. W. BAKER.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 15th day of September, 1914,
Chicago, Ill.
[SEAL.]

CHAS. L. GROBECKER,
Notary Public.

UMATILLA, LAKE COUNTY, FLA., January 25, 1914.

Dr. FREDERICK A. COOK,
Waldorf-Astoria, New York.

MY DEAR DR. COOK: Your very kind letter of January 13, inclosing letter (copy) from Admiral Schley and yours (copy) to Hon. George Edmond Foss was forwarded me from Chattanooga to this place, where I am wintering.

I thank you for your kind expressions, and feel highly honored for your appreciation of my note.

I never had a doubt as to your success in discovering the Pole, but you were from the first most unjustly and savagely treated and most so by one who should have backed you up or else be silent.

I agree with Admiral Schley that there is room enough at the Pole for two, but even if Congress makes Commander Peary a rear admiral it will not convince me that he has discovered the Pole. He may have done so, but his action toward you does not come up to my idea of a true sportsman.

My dear Doctor, you will not have to wait for your reward from our children's children. The American people are at times slow to see a truth, but they generally strike it in time, and you must remember that your claim was subjected to a deluge of vituperation, and it takes time to remove this; and bear in mind—

"Truth crushed to earth will rise again."

I anticipate and heartily wish a thorough vindication of your claim. I am,

Very respectfully and sincerely,

P. J. A. CLEARY,
Brigadier General, United States Army, Retired.

82300—14576

COPY OF INDORSEMENTS ON SCHLEY LETTER.

419 WEST THIRTY-NINTH STREET,
New York City, April 25, 1914.

I believe in Dr. Cook having reached the North Pole, as I have been with him myself and as I helped him to prepare in the lonely winter months for his dash to the pole. I have always known him for a man of his word, and, as for Civil Engineer Peary, I could point out more than once that he didn't keep his word; therefore I don't believe in any way in Civil Engineer Peary.

If I would not know some of the inside history and only read the published accounts of Dr. Cook and Civil Engineer Peary, I would be of the opinion that both reached the pole.

RUDOLPH FRANKE.

THE CREIGHTON UNIVERSITY OBSERVATORY,
TWENTY-FIFTH AND CALIFORNIA STREETS,
Omaha, Nebr., August 11, 1914.

Senator O'GORMAN, of New York:

HONORED SIR: Allow me to respectfully ask your honor to use your influence in having Congress investigate Dr. Cook's claims as to the discovery of the North Pole.

It is only fair that Congress should take up his case, as it did that of Admiral Peary, and that Dr. Cook himself should ask for such a hearing shows that he is not afraid of submitting his data to the Nation's scrutiny.

While I am personally convinced of the many advantages and even of the necessity of this investigation, my name does not in any way imply the official sanction of the Creighton University.

Respectfully, yours,

WILLIAM F. RIGGE.

Dr. FREDERICK A. COOK,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

ALBANY, January 27, 1915.

DEAR DOCTOR: I am very glad to learn that Congress is now investigating the subject of polar exploration, with special reference to the discovery of the North Pole. There has never been a doubt in my mind that your book, "My Attainment of the Pole," is a true account of results successfully and bravely accomplished by yourself, and I hope and believe that the proposed inquiry will establish your claim to priority in this great achievement. With kind regards and best wishes,

Very truly, yours,

TARLETON H. BEAN.

Dr. Tarleton H. Bean: Fish culturist, State of New York; member of the Arctic Club of America; member of Arctic expeditions to Alaska, 1880-1889.

1007 CALIFORNIA-PACIFIC BUILDING,
San Francisco, June 12, 1914.

Mr. E. C. ROST.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your favor of April 15 asking for my opinion regarding the possible attainment of the pole by Dr. Frederick A. Cook, I can only suggest that opinions are usually valueless things unless based upon justifiable reasonings. I inclose herewith such reasonings regarding Dr. Cook's polar work as I have been able to arrive at, together with such matters as go to form the basis of these reasonings.

I can not believe that anyone familiar with Arctic work, or even sufficiently familiar with Arctic history to appreciate the worth of what they read, can read with an unprejudiced mind Dr. Frederick A. Cook's "My Attainment of the Pole" and not be impressed with the vivid and realistic character of the wonderful story or fail to be impressed with the intelligence, the fidelity, and the quiet, determined courage of its author. I do not believe any man sufficiently clever to construct this story as it is written without first having had the experience.

Sincerely,

ANDREW J. STONE.

(Andrew J. Stone, traveler and explorer; has traveled over almost all parts of Arctic and sub-Arctic America; also sledged the extreme Arctic coast throughout an entire winter.)

82300-14576

PRATT, KANS., August 11, 1914.

Mr. E. C. ROST,

The New Ebbitt, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have always thought that both Dr. Cook and Peary reached the pole or got within reasonable distance of it, and I have never been able to understand why Cook has not been able to get a hearing before the proper committees and societies to pass upon his records. He is surely entitled to such a hearing.

Very truly, yours,

L. L. DYCHE.

(L. L. Dyche, member of various Peary and Cook Arctic expeditions; professor of zoology and curator of birds and mammals since 1900, University of Kansas; has made 23 scientific expeditions and hunted all over North America from Mexico to Alaska, including Greenland and the Arctic regions.)

OMAHA, NEBR., January 4, 1915.

Mr. ERNEST C. ROST,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have manuscript of many hundred pages for a book entitled "Has the North Pole Been Discovered?" It is ready for publication. If it is published, I shall be pleased to send you a copy. I prove beyond dispute that Peary never went to the pole and never intended to go there. I prove it by Peary himself. I show also that there is not a scrap of truthful evidence indicating that Cook did not go there. I review all that I know has been written, including the action of the National Geographic Society and the testimony at Washington in Peary's behalf.

Yours, very truly,

THOS. F. HALL.

(Thomas F. Hall, traveler, mariner, expert on comparative Arctic literature.)

ITHACA, N. Y., April 21, 1914.

Mr. C. E. ROST, *Chicago, Ill.*

MY DEAR SIR: Regarding my opinion about the discoverer of the North Pole, I have never changed my mind regarding this from the morning I received notice that Dr. Cook had reached this imaginary spot known as the North Pole, nor, a few days following, that Peary had also reached this spot. I sincerely believe both of these men have been there.

I have for a number of years been a close student of matters "Arctic," and I have had the pleasure of being in the field with both of these men. I have read every article that has come under my observation. I have talked with scientific men regarding the claims of each, from a scientific point of view, and the more I read and study on each side convinces me that both succeeded. I have also talked with Admiral Schley on this subject and can indorse his letter. I hope the controversy will come to an end. As Admiral Schley says, "there is honor enough for two."

Very truly, yours,

L. C. BEMENT.

ERIE, PA., June 24, 1914.

E. C. ROST, *the New Ebbitt, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: From my own personal knowledge of Dr. Cook I regard the doctor as an unusually competent leader, equal to the greatest emergency. He is the epitome of honor and sincerity.

Let the impartial limelight of a congressional investigation be turned onto the North Pole controversy.

The period of Arctic darkness is long and trying, but when the light appears it also is long and much more satisfying. Those who are trying to block this investigation know full well why they are more comfortable in the dark.

Sincerely, yours,

RALPH L. SHAINWALD, JR.

Ralph L. Shainwald, jr., explorer of Arctic Alaska.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, December 28, 1914.

Mr. E. C. ROST, *Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: In reply to your letter of the 25th instant, I would say that in the summer of 1894 I accompanied Dr. Frederick A. Cook to Greenland in the ill-fated *Miranda*, and had abundant occasion to observe his straightforward and honest character and his great resourcefulness in times of peril. When our ship was injured upon the rocks, the courage and skill which he showed in venturing 100 miles north-

82300—14576

ward along the rugged coast of Greenland in a small boat to get relief, prepared me for believing that he could accomplish any daring enterprise that was within reach of human effort. When, therefore, his report of reaching the pole came, my only doubt as to whether he had really reached the pole related to the difficulty of making accurate observations under the conditions in which he was placed. But when Peary's detailed report appeared it was evident that either both had been to the same place or that Peary had copied Cook's notes. In an interview which I had with Admiral Schley, a year or two before his death, he expressed to me his perfect confidence in Dr. Cook's honesty and ability to make observations, since he knew that Dr. Cook took great pains to perfect himself in handling instruments before his last Arctic tour.

Trusting that the truth in this whole matter may come out, I am,
Very truly, yours,

G. FREDERICK WRIGHT.

Prof. G. Frederick Wright (author of "The Ice Age of America") Arctic traveler; president of the Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society.

To the Congress of the United States:

The discoveries en route to the North Pole will be an asset to future generations. By virtue of the pioneer efforts of American explorers we have a legitimate claim upon certain lands and resources of the far North. This claim will go by default until national recognition is given to the work of Arctic explorers. It would seem, therefore, to be a Federal duty to determine the validity of the work of polar explorers.

In the Hydrographic Office the money of the taxpayers is wasted by the publication of polar maps which record false data. The falsity of these maps is an insult to other nations, and a poison to the minds of future generations, for the school histories copy such false statements because they are sent out under the guaranty of the stamp of the United States Government. Is it not our duty to see that school children are taught verified geography, when the honor of the flag and the prestige of the Nation are at stake? The answer to this question compels a determination of the status of the discoveries en route to the pole.

Engineer Peary has been paid from the Navy nearly \$100,000 for official services never rendered. He is now drawing a favor of \$6,000 annually, not for any duty ever performed in the Navy, but by virtue of appreciation of his polar efforts. The bill gives Peary \$6,000 yearly, but denies to him the credit of his claimed discovery of the pole. This denial for the credit of polar priority was forced in justice to my earlier polar attainment. There is, however, no congressional record to show that any examination has ever been made to determine the status of my demands for the claim of priority in reaching the North Pole. This Federal half action upon the work of Engineer Peary and absolute indifference to my work is an injustice to Peary; it is injustice to myself. It is an inexcusable sacrifice of national prestige. Either Peary is the discoverer of the North Pole and deserves full credit, or I am the discoverer of the pole and deserve national recognition—or the \$100,000 paid to Peary should be returned to the National Treasury. For if my case is not a national issue, how is Peary's? For the Secretary of the Navy has admitted that Peary's financial advantage is not due to his services to the United States Navy.

The work of exploration and discovery has always been a legitimate field of conquest. More territory and more material resources have been placed under the flags of nations by explorers than by all the wars of all ages. The present war in Europe, like most wars of the past, is due mostly to overreaching for spheres of influence. The nations now at war have placed millions of lives, billions of finances, on the altar of sacrifice, to win for their descendants precisely the prizes peaceably, ethically, and honestly secured by explorers, at a very small cost. Nevertheless, the pathfinding pioneers have always been compelled to beg for mere subsistence for the battle drive into the unknown, and returning, stripped of everything but life, they have gone, usually, to their graves under a blanket of abuse. A general who has killed a thousand men is lauded to the zenith of glory during his lifetime, but he who discovers a new continent is appreciated only a hundred years after his soul wanders over the dead silence of the future.

No soldier goes to fight because he expects a reward; no explorer faces the death of tropical dangers nor the arctic tortures of famine

and frost because he expects a reward. But when all is over, he does expect that a record of brotherly appreciation will be made. The polar quest, with its acquisition of territory and new resources, has been fought for 400 years and yet nearly every explorer has gone to eternity with the sting of injustice instead of the flower of timely understanding.

To obviate this during the lifetime of the men who claim to have reached the North Pole, my friends have insisted that there be a national determination of the status of the respective claims.

The discovery of the pole is not a personal matter. The flag that protects 100,000,000 people guarantees justice to the call of 100,000,000 voices for the truth of history that will be taught in the books of coming generations. In proof of this demand for Federal action my friends have offered as a documental demand petitions, letters, and official correspondence of nearly 100,000 Americans.

Contrary to a quite general impression, there never has been an official examination of the relative merits, nor an investigation of the official status of the question of priority of the discovery of the North Pole. A commission appointed by the University of Copenhagen did make a preliminary examination of a part of my data, and in the case of Engineer Peary a commission appointed by the National Geographic Society did make a preliminary examination of a part of his data. But in both cases the investigation was by way of recalculation of the nautical observations. Such observations, when taken alone, do not offer adequate proof.

An explorer's record is his final official narrative. Therein he presents all the disconnected field notes and all his observations. Unlike explorers in more favored regions, the arctic traveler, with snow for a bed and ice for a pillow, with cold fingers, chattering teeth, and an ever-shivering skin, makes only brief notes. These notes only serve as reminders, a kind of shorthand tabulation of daily events. Such notations to others are not understandable, and yet in the end of 1909, when the hasty preliminary investigation was made, there was no other data accessible. The completed record was not ready until later. The first examination was therefore premature and incomplete. And furthermore, the expert opinion, the most important proof of this work, has only been expressed in the last few years.

Three bills are now pending in Congress, all aimed to adjust the claim for polar discovery and exploration.

The first (S. J. Res. 144) was introduced by Senator MILES POINDEXTER, of Washington.

The second by Representative CHARLES B. SMITH, of New York (H. J. Res. 282).

The third by Representative CHARLES B. SMITH, of New York (H. J. Res. 383).

Contrary to a quite general impression, there is no tribunal, no society, or scientific bureau that can act with authority upon the merits or validity of an explorer's reports, and therefore, in presenting the facts upon which the claims for polar discovery are based, we are confronted at once by the quest for the precedence of the rating of earlier explorers.

There have been severe and long-continued controversies following every important discovery, and since nearly all geographic societies are composed of laymen (not geographers), who pay a certain sum yearly for the privilege of membership, there is no recognized geographic society which can be regarded as a scientific body in the sense of a technical organization such as geologic and biologic societies.

By an almost universal rule the explorer's work has been protected by some form of recognition from the government whose flag was carried into the unknown. This was preceded and followed by the slow process of digestion and assimilation of the pioneer's scientific data, and, finally, all doubts were stilled by the verification of later travelers and the expert opinion of explorers and scientific experts who have made themselves specialists along similar lines of endeavor.

It is now nearly six years since the double announcement of the discovery of the North Pole. Both records have been under the microscopic eye of all the people of all the world. Time enough has elapsed to elicit the verdict of the composite intelligence of the competent judges of all nations, and, therefore, the time would seem to be opportune for a national determination of the rival polar claims.

To this end I will offer for the consideration of Congress and the special committees to which the respective bills have been sent the following abstract of the material results of my last Arctic expedition. Upon the facts herein contained, and upon the supplementary corroborative evidence and expert opinion herein presented, I base my claim for the credit of priority in reaching the North Pole. Part of this

and much accessory data is included in "the Case of Dr. Cook," by Fred H. H. editor of the Platform, Steinway Hall, Chicago.

With the assistance of John R. Bradley, of New York, an expedition was equipped for exploring the Arctic wilds. On July 3, 1907, all arrangements were complete and we sailed in a specially equipped and rebuilt auxiliary schooner out of the harbor of Gloucester, Mass. In the end of August we arrived at Annoatok, North Greenland, at a point 700 miles from the North Pole. There, aided by John R. Bradley, I finally organized an expedition to reach by sledge the boreal center. Supplies were landed and a permanent camp was erected at Annoatok. Rudolph Franke remained as my sole civilized companion. During the long Arctic night that followed sledges were built, the equipment was perfected, Eskimos and dogs were trained for the later sledge journey over the Polar sea. Native men, women, and children extended willing hands to finally and thoroughly equip the polar sled train.

At sunrise of 1908 (Feb. 19) my expedition started for the pole, aiming to force a new route over and among the lands discovered by Capt. Otto Sverdrup.

On March 20 the last of the supporting parties returned. I had selected as my companions for the last dash two young Eskimos, Ah-we-lah and E-tuk-i-shook. We were then approximately 60 miles north of Cape Svarteroeg, in an air line 460 miles from the pole. To this point no one has ever denied my progress northward. The only point of my journey to the pole, therefore, which remains to be proven is the last 460 miles.

It is furthermore conceded by everybody that when we were later carried adrift westward on the return, that we traveled southward to Jones Sound and from there back to Annoatok and south to Upernivik. The total conceded distance, therefore, covered by my expedition, including the detours, was approximately 3,000 miles. Even if we exclude the 460 miles under dispute, my journey over the pack ice multiplies by three the longest journey over pack ice on record before or since. For the longest other journey claimed over the polar pack ice is that of Engineer Peary, and since he seems to have traveled practically in an air-line from Cape Columbia to the pole, his greatest distance is 840 miles; therefore, if my detractors concede that I am able to cover more than three times the record distance on pack ice, then they also prove without further argument the efficiency of my expedition. All discussion, therefore, on the complex problem of food and equipment is met by this doubly verified journey of 3,000 miles.

Now, as to that last 460 miles, which Peary has chosen to challenge: At the very outset he keeps me in idleness on the lifeless waste of the polar ice for two months without explaining our movements. Less than a hundred miles to the south were game lands. To the north was the reachable glory of the polar attainment. It is known that we did not go south at this time. It is not reasonable to suppose that one would sit on the ice for two months to deceive himself and the world. The only rational conclusion is that we did go north, for to do so was to satisfy an ambition nursed for 20 years.

In going northward, as we reached the eighty-third parallel we crossed a great gap dividing the land-adhering pack from the more active circumpolar drift. As we neared the eighty-fifth parallel we discovered land westward. Between the eighty-seventh and eighty-eighth we crossed what seemed like ice-covered land. We reached the pole on April 21, 1908, and noted for the first time in history the physical conditions about the top of the globe. I have given along this line an abundance of scientific data by which subsequent explorers can affirm or deny my work.

On September 1, 1909, Inspector Daugaard-Jensen, the director of Danish North Greenland, wired his Government the first news:

"Dr. Cook reached the North Pole on April 21, 1908. * * * The Eskimos of Cape York confirm Dr. Cook's story of his journey."

The next message was sent to Mrs. Cook:

"Successful. Well."

In the third message I registered my claims with the International Bureau of Polar Research at Brussels. It was directed to the secretary, Prof. Georges Lecointe:

"I reached the North Pole on April 21, 1908. Discovered land far north."

En route from Greenland I had prepared a brief report of the main results of my journey to the pole. This was published in the New York Herald on September 2, 1909. Within a few days thereafter there was turned over to the New York Herald the complete original narrative as written while in the Arctic from the original observations before civilization was reached. This was published under the title, "The Conquest of the Pole," in instalments, from September 15 to October 7.

The brief and preliminary record of my polar expedition as first published in the New York Herald is a document of great importance. This is pointed out by Edwin Swift Balch in his historic analysis, "The North Pole and Bradley Land," page 42. In this first press narrative my claim, in specific detail, goes on record. Here for the first time you have the assembled data of the original field notes. At the time when this was offered for publication I had no way of knowing of Peary's later reported claims.

The final and complete record of all the important results of my expedition were assembled and published in book form under the title "My Attainment of the Pole" in 1911. (The Polar Publishing Co., Steinway Hall, Chicago.)

Through all ages explorers have been rated not by disconnected field notes, nor by a mathematical test of calculation for position, but by the careful reexamination of all the data as presented in the final publications. When to this is added the verifying and corroborative evidence of subsequent explorers, the pioneer's effort is substantiated for all time. In so far as I am able to judge the demands of an examining board, the records of the original data to support my claim as discoverer of the North Pole as above presented is complete.

We next have to deal with the corroborative evidence, the trend of expert opinion, and charges of insincerity. At the very outset of this line of examination I wish to record the broad statement that with but one exception no competent authority on Arctic exploration has ever denied my polar success after the publication of my printed narrative in book form. The one exception is the attitude of Engineer Robert E. Peary. This statement ought to receive careful investigation, for there is a widespread belief in the minds of laymen that scientific men have given an unfavorable verdict. Of course, in a controversy which has been discussed in every center of culture and in every abode of civilization where ink is put to paper it is possible to dig up arguments on every phase of the polar conquest, just as loosely gathered statistics and hasty newspaper comment can be assembled to prove or disprove the honesty of my public document. But I repeat that, to my knowledge, there does not exist an official document in any language which denies my attainment of the pole upon scientific grounds.

Whence, then, comes the widespread opinion of doubt? Some of this is due to the seeming impossibility of the task. Some disbelief followed the natural distortions, exaggerations, and misinterpretations which follow all news reports during times of eager press competition. But a little examination will show that four-fifths of the uncertainty in the public mind is due to a prearranged press campaign. I do not mean to infer that the press has been subsidized. It has been influenced, but not by \$10,000 bills. Newspapers that can be bought are not worth buying; but every man in public life knows that it is possible for a half dozen men of large political and financial power to get together in Chicago or New York and start a storm which will lift or sink the public spirit of any man. This is particularly true in times of great news excitement, for at such times all newspapers of all the world are made the victims of the press bureaus of self-interest. The best proof of this is the bias of the present war news. Every statesman in Washington understands this kind of criminal injustice, and yet the malignant perpetrators of this crushing steam-roller movement keep out of jail by a show of keeping within the law.

Without malice, without attempting to ape the cheap tactics of re-creation, but simply in self-defense and in the interest of ethical justice in public life I want to record here certain facts which upon examination will prove a press campaign which for contemptible indecency is not equaled even in the soul-blackening times of a presidential campaign, for, as is well known, in this polar dispute the press of the entire world was sufficiently interested to copy the concocted stuff of the red-ink venders.

Within a few months after my expedition had departed for the Arctic, in 1907, there was a meeting of the Peary Arctic Club in New York. At this meeting there was a vigorous discussion of my action in seeking the pole. Previous to this all of my work of exploration was given dignified recognition by Mr. Peary and his co-operators. In proof of this case see the earlier Peary publications; also statements by Hon. FRANK T. O'HARE, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 22, 1915. But thereafter suspicion was thrown over all my work. Previously I had been a coworker; now I was a rival: and forthwith a press campaign was organized that would belittle my attempt to outdistance the chronic official seeker of the pole.

As an outcome of this meeting of the self-appointed Pole Ice Trust, pretending philanthropy, the first document on record is a letter sent

to the International Bureau of Polar Research at Brussels, Belgium. It fell to my lot to see this letter and verify the signature of Robert E. Peary. I called for a copy, which was refused on the ground that copies of official correspondence could not be given.

At a meeting of the Royal Society of Belgium in November of 1912, which was called to discuss certain phases of the polar conquest, Prof. Georges Lecointe, the secretary of the International Bureau of Polar Research, produced this letter, and then said: "This letter is the key to the polar controversy. When you understand this you will see through the entire press campaign which followed." The American consul general was present and can verify the transactions at that meeting.

As nearly as I can remember, the letter officially charged that Dr. Cook was en route to the pole without having sought a license, without authority from any accredited organization. From which was inferred that I was an insurgent among explorers, piercing, without permission, certain reserved spheres of influence, and therefore my work was unethical, unscientific, and should not receive official recognition. Among other things in the same letter I was charged with taking Peary's supplies, using his people, following in his route. These charges, as is shown by later developments, were absolutely false. The letter ended by the following statement:

"If Dr. Cook returns and claims to have reached the pole, he should be compelled to prove it."

For two years during my absence and before any claim was made, there came to the editorial desks of a thousand papers at regular intervals press material in which my prospective efforts were belittled, while Peary's next move was to be the only official campaign for the pole, and most remarkable of all, this press material carried reports of Peary's actual work when no communication had been received from the polar regions. All of this and more is brought out in Chapter XXXIII of "My attainment of the pole." It is furthermore verified by Robert J. Usher, quoted by Hon. Louis FITZHENRY in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD December 23, 1914:

"Mr. Usher has also furnished the following letter:

"NOVEMBER 23, 1914.

"My own observations lead me to believe more and more firmly that any unfavorable statement against Dr. Cook from encyclopedias, magazines, or school books can be traced back to some slanderous and unverified newspaper story. All such statements would simmer down to a few, which could be labeled "Hampton's slanders," etc. Proof of the falsity of these various statements is found outside of Dr. Cook's own statements."

The Chicago Post in its issue of November 26, 1914, published the following letter from Mr. Usher:

To the Editor of the Post.

SIR: Why does your inspired headline writer refer to Dr. Frederick Cook as "Old Doc Cook"?

Dr. Cook was born in 1865. He is a bona fide M. D. and a member of the American Medical Association, as its latest directory attests.

If the term is used as derogatory, it is well to remember that no scientific body has ever disproved his claim of having reached the North Pole in 1908 and of having climbed to the top of Mount McKinley in 1906.

Statements discrediting Dr. Cook can always be traced to cumulated newspaper statements made without reference to facts and originally instigated, in most instances, by a press bureau whose sole purpose was to destroy Dr. Cook's good name.

ROBERT J. USHER,

Assistant Reference Librarian John Crerar Library.

This press propaganda will be referred to later. Here I wish to record that my report of the discovery of the physical condition about the pole in April, 1908, as published on September 2, 1909, in the New York Herald, is the first information we have of the Boreal center.

Engineer Peary, with his widely heralded expedition, left the shores of the United States one year later. He therefore left civilization about three months after I had reached the pole. The question of priority is established by the fixed dates of departure. The question, therefore, now at issue is not one of dates, but did either polar claimant reach the pole?

In the bill which retired Peary on a pension of \$6,000 per year Congress has conceded that Peary reached the pole on April 6, 1909, but his claim of being the only polar victor was denied by Congress in eliminating from the pension bill the words "discovery of the pole."

It would seem in the light of this Federal record that Peary's claim for recognition is closed, but the question of credit for priority is open.

This phase of the polar conquest in the interest of national prestige and to give an official record for the benefit of our school children is thoroughly summed up by the Hon. LOUIS FITZHENRY. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF Dec. 23, 1914.)

Engineer Peary's first report, wherein he gave his observations of the physical conditions about the pole, was issued about a week later than mine. In it he denied my success. If therefore he unconsciously and unwillingly proves the validity of my claim, he is a witness of double value.

An examination of Peary's various publications will prove conclusively that his report is a scientific parallel of mine. This was first noted by the late Rear Admiral W. S. Schley and later substantiated by the researches of practically all Arctic explorers.

This comparative study of the data by which Peary proves my position step by step is really remarkable, more especially when it is remembered that Peary is on record as saying that "Dr. Cook has handed the world a gold-brick."

By a careful search through the published official records Mr. E. C. Rost has plotted this parallel scientific data. This is verified by S. J. Entrikin, Ralph J. Shainwald, Maurice Connell, L. C. Bement, Capt. Edward A. Haven, Dr. Middleton Smith, and other Arctic explorers. (Hon. FRANK T. O'HAIR, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 2311, January, 1915.)

A careful study of this relief chart (Fred High, The case of Dr. Cook) of comparative polar data by Rost, proves the statement of the late Rear Admiral Schley that "each is the eyewitness of the other's success," or that he who came second copied the first reports.

On this chart it will be noted that Peary's report confirmed mine in every important scientific detail. My account of the physical conditions about the pole did not fit any previous theory. Peary's report in substance was a parallel of mine. Peary denied my success and said that he was the only one who had reached the pole. If he therefore unconsciously proves my case, he is a witness of double value. The existence of the lands which I have reported are proven by Peary's description of land-divided ice farther east and by other similar parallel data, and thus my position is absolutely established to and beyond the eighty-eighth parallel, and Peary's position to within 100 miles of the pole is proven by a similar comparison.

This leaves only about 100 miles of the disputed 460 miles to verify. Over this last 100 miles and at the pole I have reported an absence of land and life; a sea of highly colored moving ice, composed of large, smooth ice fields. Here and elsewhere I have reported winds, thermometric records, tidal action on the pack, physical conditions of the sea ice. These and all the minutest detail, down to the psychology of the men with me are confirmed by parallel statements by Peary in his official narrative.

Rear Admiral W. S. Schley was one of the first to note that Peary's report was in reality a scientific duplicate of mine, and that by his parallel material my position was verified and proven. In the end of 1909, at the time when it was popular to belittle and ridicule my work, Schley said his judgment was made upon his knowledge of Arctic conditions; that he had gone over both accounts carefully, and that it would take more than an academic lever to change his mind. Again, a year later, Admiral Schley placed himself on record by the following letter:

1826 I STREET,
Washington, D. C., January 7, 1911.

DEAR DR. COOK: I thank you very much for your kind letter, and I assure you that I have never varied in the belief that you and Civil Engineer Peary reached the pole. After reading the published accounts daily and critically of both claimants I was forced to the conclusion from their striking similarity that each of you was the eye witness of the other's success.

Without collusion it would have been impossible to have written accounts so similar, and yet, in view of the ungracious controversy that has occurred since, that view (collusion) would be impossible to imagine.

While I have never believed that either of you got to within a pin-point of the pole, I have steadfastly held that both got as near the goal as was possible to ascertain, considering the imperfections of the instruments used, and the personal errors of individuals under circumstances so adverse to absolute accuracy.

82300—14576

Again, I have been broad enough in my views to believe that there was room enough at the pole for two, and never narrow enough to believe that only one man got there.

I believe that both are entitled to the honor of achievement.

Yours, very truly,

W. S. SCHLEY.

This letter was sent out by the Associated Press on January 11, 1911. When Henry Gannett, one of Peary's experts, read this in the papers, he phoned Admiral Schley and asked if he had written it. Admiral Schley answered, "Yes; what is the matter with it? Isn't it a good letter?"

More than 50 other Arctic explorers and scientific experts have either in private letters or published statements expressed a similar opinion.

This, with the detailed records as published in my narrative from original documents and photographs, I offer as proof, to substantiate my claim as being the first to reach the North Pole.

And, as further proof, let us note that my opponents do not argue on the merits of polar exploration, but by a series of side issues, such as the distorted news reports on the Mount McKinley ascent, the yellow journal "confessions," the false reports of the Danish verdict, and a dozen other press explosions. I am ready to go before a committee acting for the United States Government to present the other scientific results of my polar effort, and also to meet one and all of the insinuations aimed to undermine the sincerity of my work.

To be able to present an unbiased expert opinion of the observations to determine geographic location taken en route to the pole Mr. Clark Brown, of Albany, N. Y., has reported as follows:

RECALCULATIONS AND VERIFICATIONS OF NAUTICAL OBSERVATIONS.

[By Clark Brown, of Albany, N. Y.]

"Though Dr. Cook has never claimed absolute accuracy for his observations, they are found to be at least as accurate and more complete than those of Mr. Peary. In fairness to Mr. Peary and those who have pronounced in his favor solely upon the nautical data, Dr. Cook has insisted that his observations be given the same test as was given to Peary's data by the congressional investigators.

"After having seen and studied Dr. Cook's original field papers upon which his most important observations were calculated, and after having seen his day-by-day log book as written in duplicate while in the Arctic, I compared the original notes and data with the published statements, and I have reached the following conclusions from the quoted source:

"The following extracts from Dr. Cook's book 'My Attainment of the Pole' and the connecting explanatory notes supply the data for and are illustrated by the diagram. (Diagram of polar observations by Clark Brown.)

"Our course when arriving at the pole,' says Dr. Cook, on pages 288 and 289, 'as near as it was possible to determine was on the ninety-seventh meridian. The day was April 21, 1908. It was local noon. The sun was 11° 55' above the magnetic northern horizon. My shadow, a dark, purple-blue streak, with ill-defined edges, measured 26 feet in length. The tent pole, marked as a measuring stick, was pushed into the snow, leaving 6 feet above the surface. This gave a shadow 28 feet long.

"Several sextant observations gave a latitude a few seconds below 90°, which, because of unknown refraction and uncertain accuracy of time, was placed at 90°. Other observations on the next day gave similar results, although we shifted camp 4 miles toward the magnetic south.

"On page 573 we find a transcript of his log book from which we see that on April 20 he set his course for the ninety-seventh meridian, and on April 21, 1908, he traveled from 1 a. m. to 9 a. m., covering 13½ miles. Having made camp, he slept in the tent a short time; and then, after the observations at noon, from which he figured his position as latitude 89° 59' 45", he advanced 14" (shown in manuscript as —pd 14—), and pitched the tent, made a snow house, and prepared for two rounds of observations. During the time occupied in taking these observations he moved camp 4 miles magnetic south. This change of position is spoken of on pages 289, 296, 302, and 573. On page 296 he says:

"At 6 o'clock, or six hours after our arrival at local noon, I arose, went out of the igloo, and took a double set of observations. Returning, I did some figuring, laid down on my bag, and at 10 o'clock, or four hours later, leaving Ah-we-lah to guard the camp and dogs, E-tuk-i-shook joined me to make a tent camp about 4 miles to the magnetic

south. My object was to have a slightly different position for subsequent observations.

"Placing our tent, bags, and camp equipment on a sled we pushed it over the ice field, crossed a narrow lead of sheeted young ice, and moved on to another field which seemed to have much greater dimensions. We erected the tent, not quite two hours later, in time for a midnight observation. These sextant readings of the sun's altitude were continued for the next 24 hours."

All the observations herein mentioned are found grouped on page 302, as follows:

The sun's true central altitude at the pole April 21 and 22, 1908: Seven successive observations taken every six hours. Each observation is reduced for an instrumental error of $-2'$; for semidiameter and also for refractions and parallax, $-9'$. The seven reductions are calculated from sextant readings, generally of an upper and lower limb.

Taken from my field notes.

[April 21, 1908.]

Ninety-seventh meridian local time, 12 o'clock (noon), $11^{\circ} 54' 40''$.

Same camp, 6 p. m., $12^{\circ} 00' 10''$.

Moved camp 4 miles magnetic.

South, 12 o'clock (midnight), $12^{\circ} 3' 50''$.

[April 22, 1908.]

Six o'clock a. m., $12^{\circ} 9' 30''$.

Twelve o'clock noon, $12^{\circ} 14' 20''$.

Six o'clock p. m., $12^{\circ} 18' 40''$.

Twelve o'clock midnight, $12^{\circ} 25' 10''$.

Temperature, -41 . Barometer, 30.05.

Shadow, $27\frac{1}{2}$ feet (of 6-foot pole).

From these observations on page 302 I have computed the mean position of the pole. The data from the Nautical Almanac required in reducing the observations is the sun's declination and the hourly change at Greenwich apparent noon as follows:

1908	Declina- tion.	Hourly change.
	$^{\circ}$ $'$ $''$	$''$
Apr. 21, noon.....	11 48 57.5	50.96
Apr. 22, noon.....	12 9 14.9	50.47
Apr. 23, noon.....	12 20 20.4	49.46

Having plotted the relative positions of the three camps in the immediate vicinity of the pole, I gave each a name. The first tent camp is called "Stop 1." The snow igloo is called "Camp Ah-we-lah's Farthest." The extreme tent is called "E-tuk-i-shook's Farthest."

After reducing each observation separately, I plot the approximate result of each observation in its relation to the sun and the observer's station. The notation Obs. 1, Q 1, and P 1 is used to show the positions of the observer and the sun at the time of the observation, and the position of the pole is indicated by the first observation. The same notation, numbered consecutively, is used for the subsequent observations.

The mean position of P 1, P 3, P 5, and P 7 gives the accepted position of the pole in one direction, while P 2, P 4, and P 6 locate it the other way. From this mean result the meridian and parallels are drawn. I have used the character "Q" to represent the sun and have taken a minute arc equal to a mile, to follow the practice of the United States Navy. The finished drawing and the table of computations has been verified by a number of experienced engineers, who have appended their signatures and have given their colleges and degrees.

While some allowances must be made for error by refraction and time, Dr. Cook's observations prove that in his march between camps on April 21, 1908, and again on April 23, he was within a fraction of a mile of the North Pole, and that at his last camp he was about a mile beyond the pole.

An additional proof of the reasonable correctness of Dr. Cook's observations is brought out in a study of the variation of the compass en route to the pole. (Map of Magnetic Variation in the North Polar Region. Compiled by Clark Brown, Albany, N. Y.)

CLARK BROWN, Albany, N. Y.

There has been much idle speculation in the press about "records and proofs" of an explorer's doings. The proof and record of a voyage of discovery is the assembled data of the official reports, which are usually published in book form. Upon the records there presented an explorer is judged by future generations.

Since the publication of my complete report in book form in 1911, there has not, to my knowledge, been published in English or any other language, as indicated before, a single authentic paper or document or book which denies my polar attainment on scientific grounds. On the other hand, from a historical standpoint the validity of my work is supported and the insinuations against it are invalidated by many publications. Foremost among these is the book from the pen of the geographic historian, Edwin Swift Balch, entitled "The North Pole and Bradley Land," Campion & Co., Philadelphia.

Mr. Fred High, in his "Case of Dr. Cook," summarizes the scientific deductions of Balch as follows:

"Before taking up Balch's unbiased analysis of the evidence of the North Pole discovery, it should be remembered that the work of Admiral Wilkes in the Antarctic came under the unfair criticism of rival interests, as did Dr. Cook's journey to the pole. For more than 50 years the name of Wilkes was taken from the map. Balch analyzed this injustice, fought the battle for Wilkes during 15 years against critics, including the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, and at last the Australian expedition rediscovered Wilkes Land, and thus, Balch won against the onslaught of Sir Clements Markham and others."

The study of the polar controversy by Balch was worked out in a similar way. It is difficult to give an abstract, but we can quote his conclusions:

Balch strongly emphasizes the fact that Dr. Cook could not have had anything on which to base his description of physical conditions north of 83.20° north latitude; and as Dr. Cook's descriptions agree with those later given by Peary on a parallel route farther east, there could be no doubt that Dr. Cook's journey was made and that the line of his march across was first executed.

The reason for this is that these statements can be based on nothing but Cook's own observations, for Cook started from Denmark, from south Greenland, before Peary started for Labrador from north Greenland, and therefore everything that Cook stated or wrote, published immediately after his arrival in Europe, must be based on what Cook observed or experienced himself.

Cook's original narrative stands on its own merits; it is the first and most vital proof of Cook's veracity, and yet it has passed almost unnoticed.

There are three points in particular which claim attention. The first is the account of the land sighted in 84.20° north to 85.11° north—Bradley Land. The second is the glacial land ice in 87.88° north. The third is the account of the discovery of the North Pole and the description of the ice at the North Pole.

Cook's first great discovery, the writer holds, was Bradley Land, named after his friend and backer. The land, Cook declared, had a great crevasse in it, making it appear like two islands, the southerly one starting at 84.20° north. Peary made no mention of land north of 83.20° north. But he corroborated Cook about Bradley Land by sounding in 310 fathoms a little below 86° north. Bradley Land is placed on Peary's own map.

"The second discovery of Cook's is the glacial land ice in 87° north to 87° north— 88° north," says the writer. "A closely similar occurrence was observed by Peary on his 1906 trip in about 86° north 60° west."

But the most important particular in which the two men agreed, in the mind of Mr. Balch, is in their description of the ice at the pole. Cook reported that it was "a smooth sheet of level ice." The writer adds: "If that description of the North Pole is accurate, the writing of it by Cook, first of all men, on the face of it is proof that Cook is the discoverer of the North Pole."

But not only was the ice at the North Pole smooth and level, but the snow there was "purple" in the story of Cook, a detail in which he was again borne out by Peary.

"Purple snow," says the writer, "is linguistic impressionism, an attempt to suggest with words what Frank Wilbert Stokes has done with paints in his superb pictures of the polar regions. Hence," he says, "the use of the word 'purple' by Dr. Cook, who is not a trained artist, proves that he has the eye of the impressionist painter, and that he is an extremely accurate observer of his surroundings."

"That Cook's description is accurate is, in the next place, certified to by Peary. Peary corroborates Cook absolutely about conditions at

the North Pole; and Cook is corroborated by Peary not only by what Peary saw but by what he did. If there was anything in the western Arctic, between the North Pole and 87.47° north, but an 'endless field of purple snows,' smooth and slippery, Peary could not have covered the intervening 133 geographical miles in two days and a few hours. Peary therefore, from observation and from actual physical performance, proves that Cook's most important statement is true."

The evidence is thus examined step by step. The statements of the two men are compared word by word, and this is the conclusion reached:

"In view of all these facts, it becomes certain that Cook must have written his description of the North Pole from his own observations, for until Cook actually traveled the western Arctic, between 88° north and the North Pole, and told the world the facts, no one could have said whether in that area there was land or sea, nor have stated anything of the condition of its ice, with its unusual, perhaps unique, flat surface."

"But Cook, in his first cable dispatch, stated definitely and positively and finally that at the North Pole there was no land, but sea frozen over into smooth ice, and Peary confirmed Cook's statements."

"Cook was accurate; and the only possible inference is that Cook was accurate because Cook knew, and the further inevitable conclusion is that since Cook knew, Cook had been at the North Pole."

In Europe there has been a general reexamination of the rival polar claims, and since the publication of the work of Edwin Swift Balch the trend of opinion of historic geographers has gradually vindicated Dr. Cook. Prof. Otto Baschin, president of the Geographical Institute of the Berlin University, has published in the *Berliner Tageblatt* for July 27, 1913, also in *Petermann's Mittheilungen*, No. 59, a scientific analysis of the injustice of the polar controversy, in which he says that Dr. Cook has been unjustly suspicioned and wronged; that his proofs are sufficient.

"Gradually," says Baschin, "voices from everywhere are heard to take up Dr. Cook's cause in his favor, and the truth of his reports of the attainment of the North Pole is now generally believed and accepted."

Among many other European authorities, Dr. Fritz Machatschek, of Austria, in the *Deutsche Rundschau für Geographie*, Vol. I, No. 36, 1912-14, makes out a clear case for Dr. Cook. After examining the evidence for and against the polar claims, he comes to the following conclusion:

"If Cook had really wished to fool the world, if his wholly competent report (his book) which is before me, with the picturing of the most fearful overwintering of 1908 was only a chain of lies (as his detractors declare), and he in reality went only a few days' march to the north from Axel Heiberg Land, then one must ask, Why did he not turn backward in the same year to the Eskimo settlements in the northern part of Greenland; why did he not want the world to believe that he could make the round trip to the pole in one summer, just as Peary did it? Why did he voluntarily winter far from all relief stations?"

"By unprejudiced judges Cook's attainment of the North Pole can not be denied, and the words of Balch will help to spread this verdict."

By a careful examination of the brief outline of the most important data resulting from my journey en route to the pole any group of men of average intelligence can come to a reasonable conclusion on the validity of my polar attainment. There remains but one phase: What is the verdict of expert opinion? I have given the opinion of the geographic historian, but what is the opinion of the polar explorer?

When Engineer Peary, reporting his work a year later than mine, wired that he had "nailed the Stars and Stripes to the pole" in a glad-handed spirit I wired Peary my congratulations and said there was room enough and honor enough at the pole for two. His reply to my friendly attitude was the famous "gold-brick" message: "Dr. Cook has handed the public a gold brick," and thereafter Peary made himself witness, judge, and jury in a case where Peary was to derive the benefit. All of this is now newspaper history, but a brief review of this phase of the polar controversy is likely to be placed under the eyes of men who aim to determine the justice of both polar claims.

Following the "gold-brick" message Peary chose to force a press campaign to deny my success and to proclaim himself as the sole polar victor. Peary aimed to be retired as a rear admiral on a pension of \$6,000 per year. This ambition was granted, but Congress rejected his claim for priority by eliminating from the pension bill the words "discovery of the pole." This, of course, was done because of my prior work. The European geographical societies, forced under dip-

omatic pressure to honor Peary, have also refused him the title of "discoverer." By a final verdict of the American Government and of the highest European authorities Peary is therefore denied the assumption of being the "discoverer of the pole," though his claim as a rediscoverer is allowed. The evasive inscriptions on the Peary medals prove this statement, and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD gives the final Federal verdict.

During the time of the intense newspaper controversy it seemed to be desirable to bring the question to a focus by submitting to some authoritative body for decision. Such an institution, however, does not exist. Previously explorers had been rated by the slow process of historic digestion and assimilation of the facts offered, but it was thought that an academic examination must meet the demands. Engineer Peary first submitted his case to a commission appointed by the National Geographic Society of Washington, D. C. This is a private, unofficial organization, in which anybody is admitted as a "national geographer" upon payment of \$2 per year. It is, furthermore, well known that this society was financially interested in Peary to the extent of \$25,000, and some of its favored members were the recipients of valuable furs and trophies. Common decency would demand that an organization with a monetary interest and whose members had received illegitimate favors would withdraw as a jury, but a little investigation will show that such ethical justice does not enter the realm of the National Geographic Society.

This society did fully and freely indorse Peary as the "discoverer of the North Pole," and its action was indorsed without independent examination by other American societies. However, a year later in Congress the same men who acted as a commission of experts for the above society unwillingly admitted that from a nautical standpoint there was in Peary's proofs no positive proof.

My data was sent to a commission appointed by the University of Copenhagen. The Danes reported that the material presented was incomplete. This statement, however, did not carry the interpretation that the pole had not been reached. The Danes have never said, as they have been quoted by the press, that I did not reach the pole; quite the contrary: the University of Copenhagen conferred the degree of doctor of philosophy and the Royal Danish Geographical Society gave a gold medal, both in recognition of the merits of the polar effort.

This early examination was based mostly upon the nautical calculations for position, and both verdicts when analyzed gave the version that in such observations there was no positive proof. The Washington jury ventured an opinion. The Danes refused to give an opinion, but showed their belief in my success by conferring honorary degrees.

It is the unfair interpretation of the respective verdicts by the newspapers following an admiral making propaganda that precipitated the turbulent air of distrust which previously rested over the entire polar achievement. All this, however, has now been cleared by the final word of 50 of the foremost polar explorers and scientific experts.

In so far as they were able to judge from all the data presented in the final books of both claimants, the following experts have given it as their opinion that I reached the pole:

Rear Admiral W. S. Schley, United States Navy, commander of the Greely relief expedition.

Capt. Otto Sverdrup, discoverer of the land over which Dr. Cook's route was forced.

Capt. J. E. Bernier, commanding the Canadian Arctic expeditions.

Prof. G. Frederick Wright, author of *The Ice Age of North America*.

Brig. Gen. P. J. A. Cleary, retired.

Prof. W. H. Brewer, for 16 years president of the Arctic Club of America.

Prof. Julius Payer, of the Weyprecht-Payer expedition.

Prof. L. L. Dyche, member of various Peary and Cook expeditions.

Mr. Edwin S. Brooke, jr., of the Crocker land expedition.

Mr. Maurice Connell, of the Greely expedition and the United States Weather Bureau.

Prof. Samuel P. Orth, Cornell University, Miranda expedition.

Mr. Samuel J. Entrikin, second in command, Peary expedition, 1894.

Dr. Middleton Smith, Point Barrow expedition.

Capt. O. C. Hamlet, United States Army, Arctic Revenue Service.

Capt. E. A. Haven, of the Ziegler expedition.

Prof. Otto Baschin, president of the Geographical Institute of the Berlin University.

Dr. A. Wedemeyer, of the German imperial marine department.

Mr. Andrew J. Stone, explorer of the north coast of America.

Mr. Dillon Wallace, Labrador explorer.

Mr. Edwin Swift Balch, author of *The North Pole and Bradley Land*.

Capt. Ejnar Mikkelsen, leader of expeditions to Behring Sea and East Greenland.

Capt. R. Bergendahl, Giala-Ziegler expedition.

Commodore John Byers Wirt, commanding naval veterans, United States Navy.

F. H. Hopkins Smith, author, artist, traveler.

Capt. Johan Menander, B. S. Osbon, and Thomas F. Hall.

Messrs. Henry Biederbeck, Frederick B. Wright, F. F. Taylor, Ralph H. Cairns, Theodore Lerner, M. Van Rysselberghe, J. Knowles Hare, Charles E. Riffler, Homer Rogers, R. C. Bates, E. C. Rost, L. C. Bement, Clarence Wychoff, Alfred Church, Archibald Dickinson, George B. Butland, Ralph Shainwald, Henry Johnson, Clark Brown, W. F. Armbruster, John R. Bradley, Harry Whitney, and Rudolph Franke.

Drs. T. F. Dedrick, H. J. Egbert, W. H. Axtell, A. H. Cordier, and Henry Schwartz.

Father William F. Rigge, astronomer, Creighton University.

Judge Jules Leclercq and Prof. Georges Lec Inte, secretary of the International Bureau of Polar Research; and others.

Thus indorsed by practically all polar explorers, my attainment of the pole and my earlier work of discovery and exploration is further established by the following honorary pledges of recognition (these are now in my possession, the press reports to the contrary being untrue):

By the King of Belgium, decorated as knight of the Order of Leopold.

By the University of Copenhagen, in conferring the degree of Ph. D.

By the Royal Danish Geographical Society, presentation of a gold medal.

By the Arctic Club of America, presentation of a gold medal.

By the municipality of the city of Brussels, presentation of a gold medal.

By the Royal Geographical Society of Belgium, presentation of a gold medal.

By the municipality of the city of New York, with the ceremony of presenting the keys and offering the freedom of the city.

By the physicians of Benton Harbor, Mich., presentation of a gold medal.

Without denying Engineer Peary's success, I note that his case rests upon the opinion of three of his official associates in Washington. Three men acting for a society financially interested—three men who have never seen a piece of polar ice—have given it as their opinion that on April 6, 1909 (about a year after my journey), Mr. Peary reached the pole. By many this was accepted as a final verdict of experts for Peary; but are such men dependable experts? Furthermore, the mere fact that Peary was under a pension of \$6,000 per year during the agitation of the rival polar claims has freed the final public opinion that Peary is officially accepted as the discoverer of the pole. No such injustice was intended by Congress, and this misinterpretation surely forces the action to make my prior claims as discoverer of the North Pole a Federal issue. In the interest of fair play, we, in a democratic form of government, will not concede that a pension and a uniform decides a question of national honor.

In the above outline of my claim for recognition as discoverer of the North Pole I have tried to indicate five independent methods of examination and verification:

First. An examination of the important data embodied in my various reports which have been issued as public documents. These are the official records of the expedition. This I am ready to supplement by the accessible field notes and photographs.

Second. The comparative method of verification which was indorsed by Rear Admiral Schley, which has been plotted by Mr. E. C. Rost and also verified by a number of Arctic explorers.

Third. An examination and recalculation of the nautical observations for position as outlined by Clark Brown and verified by competent experts.

Fourth. The acute historic analysis and certification of certain facts and stages of progress as outlined by Edwin Swift Balch in his book, "The North Pole and Bradley Land."

Fifth. The expert opinion of the Arctic explorers of all nations. This ought to be supplemented by calling upon expert witnesses of living explorers and scientific men who specialize in this line of research.

If there is any other method of examination that it is thought important to pursue, I am ready to offer all the assistance I can. All that I have ever asked for is a fair hearing and a fair understanding, and my main object in getting the data of my voyage of polar discovery and exploration before Congress is to have a Federal record for future

generations, which record will fortify our claims to new lands and valuable resources of the north.

In reply to the many insinuations against the sincerity of my polar efforts I ask the privilege to record that every vehicle of doubt was rolled out of the Peary admiral-making camp. However, fate has been unkind to Peary, for to-day every side attack that he has forced on me can be used with double force against Peary. It would seem that in a sportsmanlike claim for national honor the scientific merits of the work in question would be the sole test. I have answered all in the last pages of the book, "My Attainment of the Pole." Peary chose to paint his anger and animosity in the flaring red ink of a press campaign. In his book, "The North Pole," Peary ignores his previous desperate attempt to disprove my prior claim by the mere assertion that he is the "discoverer," and that no one else could reach the pole without adopting the "Peary system."

However, it is worthy of note that no one since has adopted the "Peary system," neither Amundsen, Scott, or McMillan, and that the best record of this "system" is less than one-third of the conceded distance covered by my system. Peary has spent about a million dollars to build his system; mine has cost less than \$10,000. An investigation of the comparative scientific results of the two systems will bring out some important lessons for future explorers.

I do not ask that the floor of Congress be used to air a personal dispute. Indeed, I have always taken the ground that the cheap tactics of trying to bury the main issues by side attacks should not be dragged into a contest for national honor. If, however, this simple problem of proving my claim for the credit of priority in reaching the North Pole is to be rated by side issues, then I do ask for the common justice of a court of law wherein the credibility and self-interest of the vendors of distrust be first examined, and, above all, I want the opportunity of facing my accusers.

Since the introduction in Congress of the various bills bearing upon the polar problem every Senator and Representative has been sent certain abusive letters and publicity material. On the desk, therefore, of every Congressman there is proof that this battle is to be fought, not upon the merits of the work, but upon the striking force of insinuations upon personal veracity. If this is to be the method of examination, I am ready to open the back pages of my past life and will insist upon going into the minutest detail; but in such an event both polar claimants should be judged by the same standard, and, furthermore, the men responsible for the campaign of doubt should first be put under a similar test.

As a prelude to this kind of examination I wish to record an outline of the admiral-making campaign, from which, I am ready to prove, emanated every charge against my sincerity. This, it will be remembered, was begun two years before my return from the north.

In the end of September, 1909, when the public wearied of Peary's unsportsmanlike attitude, mostly because of his "gold-brick" messages, Peary wired Gen. Thomas Hubbard to meet him to direct a campaign against Dr. Cook. The editor of the New York Times was also summoned. This part of the deal is a matter of public record in the press of the day, but the doings behind closed doors that followed have never been made public. Thereafter, however, with but one exception (record of Peary's injustice about Benton Harbor, Mich.; documents published of Benton Harbor November 18 to 24, 1913), Peary became a mental prisoner of Hubbard. The New York Times and its affiliated papers became the mouthpiece of a new campaign, best designated as the admiral-making propaganda. Herbert L. Bridgman, the self-confessed mental valet of Hubbard, had previously wired Peary over the New York Herald wires to put a soft pedal on future "gold-brick" messages. Thereafter Gen. Hubbard became Peary's press agent and Bridgman the dispenser of pro-Peary press fabrications.

It is known that Gen. Hubbard was the president and his underling, Bridgman, was secretary of the Pole Ice Trust, otherwise known as the Peary Arctic Club. The Pole Trust was changed to a Peary press bureau, and to prove the power of this press bureau Bridgman told Clark Brown, of Albany, N. Y., that \$350,000 had been subscribed "to see Peary through." The millionaire press agent, Gen. Hubbard, told Belmore Browne, of Tacoma, that he would spend his last dollar to beat Dr. Cook, and forthwith money began to pour into the melting pot of polar defamation. Another tin soldier, the would-be United States Senator known in Tacoma as "Slippery Jim Ashton," was engaged for a mysterious mission. Ashton had learned something in his campaign for the Senate, and he added his slippery political methods to the slime-dispensing Hubbard's methods. On the day before New York officially received me as the discoverer of the North Pole by

offering the honor of the freedom of the city there appeared a press broadside of false statements, like that which is concocted against a candidate for office on the day before election. Gen. Ashton was the self-confessed vender of this. Gen. Hubbard was the instigator, and Peary was the profit sharer. In this full page of press material, by which 1,000 papers were made a party to the conspiracy, it was attempted to show that Mount McKinley had not been climbed by me as I had previously described. Gen. Hubbard next paid some \$8,000 to Belmore Browne and others to gather anti-Cook reports bearing upon the ascent of Mount McKinley. These reports were recently sent to various Congressmen with letters from Gen. Hubbard. If the examining board aims to go further into this problem, I am ready to present other documents.

For the present I propose to support my first ascent of Mount McKinley by the following documents:

1. The official record of the expedition, "To the Top of the Continent"; Doubleday, Page & Co., New York.
2. Chapter 34 of "My Attainment of the Pole," third edition; Polar Publishing Co., Steinway Hall, Chicago.
3. "Mount McKinley: Its Bearing on the Polar Controversy," by E. C. Rost.
4. "Mount McKinley and Mountain Climbers' Proofs," by Edwin Swift Balch.

5. Hon. FRANK T. O'HAIR, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 22, 1915. In further proof of this vile press campaign, I offer an article by Elbert Hubbard, *The Philistine*, "Article on Arctic explorers," page 161.

Since Elbert Hubbard says that he was on the editorial list of a publicity bureau, and since it is known that this bureau reaches 6,000,000 people daily, the article in question, though not intended as scientific data, would seem to be material proof of a very far-reaching press propaganda, and again I repeat it is, furthermore, this same press propaganda which is responsible for most of the polar distrust.

Following the black-hand efforts of the Mount McKinley attack, Gen. Hubbard and his hirelings moved camp to the Hubbard Memorial Hall at Washington, D. C. Here Gen. Hubbard and his agent, Gilbert Grosvenor, are engaged in a get-rich quick scheme which they call the National Geographic Society. In return for the easy cash of \$2 per year, Grosvenor makes a national geographer with equal facility of a street sweeper or a diplomat; all who will pay the \$2 get by post a highly colored certificate of membership. This certificate, for bald faced dishonesty and deception, would put federally suppressed mining stocks to shame. Three hundred thousand people are thus deceived to become members of this organization, which, with inconceivable vanity, calls itself the National Geographic Society, referred to in the following resolution:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

January 21, 1915.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland submitted the following resolution, which was referred to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads and ordered to be printed:

House resolution 709.

Whereas the National Geographic Society of Washington, D. C., a private enterprise, enjoys privileges granted by the Post Office Department which are not granted to other magazines, but which the Third Assistant Postmaster General, in a letter dated January 26, 1914, says he has and is conceding to the National Geographic Society; and

Whereas this discrimination by the Post Office Department in favor of the National Geographic Society means a loss of over \$300,000 annually to the Post Office Department; and

Whereas since the National Geographic Society is not national (in the sense that it is not a bureau of nor connected with the National Government in any capacity whatsoever), is not geographic, is not scientific, and is not a society, but is simply and solely a private publishing house, no special privileges should be granted to it: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Postmaster General explain to Congress why privileges amounting to discrimination are granted to the private enterprise known as the National Geographic Society.

Gen. Hubbard easily annexed this society to the North Pole Trust. Its treasury was separated from \$25,000 to get in on the ground floor with Peary. This \$25,000, by the way, was the price paid for the privilege of acting as a jury for Peary and Hubbard. The same Gen. Hubbard, as admitted by ex-President Taft, requested the President to see Peary through on the admiral-making trail. All of this is recorded in

the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and elsewhere, if the examining board chooses to investigate the injustice of this kind of double-dealing.

The part of this same campaign which is material just now is recorded in the various efforts by which Gen. Hubbard has tried to prevent a bearing on the bills now before Congress. First, Grosvenor made his rounds among the Congressmen lobbying for Peary and serving out Gen. Hubbard's insinuations about the ascent of Mount McKinley.

This was followed by personal letters with books to Congressmen, always about Mount McKinley.

A little later a Philadelphia lawyer, by the name of Alexander, took up the Hubbard burden by sending letters to Congressmen, accompanied by a nameless and dateless press sheet. This press sheet is the duplicate of an anonymous letter signed "Veritas," which previously was sent all over the country by some one. Again in this the Hubbard-McKinley fabricated charges were sent out. The spineless Alexander soon wearied of his task, and that congressional laundry now used by those who have dirty national linen to wash—the Congressional Information Bureau—was pressed into service. As is well known, since lobbying has become unhealthy, this bureau is substituted for the former Capitol gum shoers, and mail carriers are made to do the work for which former lobbyists were sent to jail. Again, by this method Gen. Hubbard's false statements about Mount McKinley were sent out.

Mount McKinley has no connection with the conquest of the pole; but since it is the illegitimate creation of the Hubbard-Peary family; since it is the white hope of the North Pole Trust and its subsidiary, the National Geographic Society; since Gen. Hubbard has waggered his millions in raising this white hope, by all means from this angle it is a material subject for investigation.

It will be remembered when I returned and reported an average speed of 15 miles per day, Gen. Hubbard and company charged me with the crime of exceeding the polar speed limits. When Peary returned, reporting a speed that doubled mine, there was a dead silence in the Pole Trust.

About two months ago Donald B. McMillan reported the disappearance of Peary's "Crocker Land." Again there is dead silence in the Hubbard-Peary camp. Why?

Again I insist, if the claims for polar honors are to be judged by past records, ethics, and morals, I accept the challenge, but I want to face my accusers.

As one of the interested parties of an unjustified and unwarranted controversy I am bound to give vent to the pain of the whip of injustice which has been snapped at me, but all I ask for is a verdict on the merits of my polar efforts. I bear no malice to anyone. I do not claim to have placed my bat on the North Pole; I do not claim to have placed my feet on the pin point of the earth's axis. I certainly did not nail a piece of bunting to a pole of frozen air, but I do claim to have lifted the Stars and Stripes first of all men at the boreal center. I do claim that the American eagle has spread its wings of glory over the world's top. I do not deny that there is room enough and honor enough under those wings for others.

My appeal to Congress and to my fellow countrymen is not entirely personal. The polar regions have certain valuable resources which will be an important asset to future generations. It is true the North Pole is in the center of a deep sea. It has no value, either scientific or commercial, and no explorer ever supposed it would have. The poles of the earth could be better and more accurately located from Washington than in the regions of the poles. To touch the pin point of the pole, therefore, is not the object of polar exploration.

Our main object is to pierce the unknown and replace the blank spots upon our charts by the topographic outline of lands, the delineation of seas, and above all to bring back a knowledge of the physical condition about the top of the globe. Such knowledge is very important to the people of all sections of the earth. For example, our weather conditions are not entirely understandable until we know the weather of Canada. In Canada weather is a mystery until the storm-delivering centers about the pole are studied. The same is true of geology, of biology, of anthropology, and of every branch of national science.

There is an interlinking of all the terrestrial conditions, and, therefore, to know the globe as a whole there must not be large blank spots on our maps. To meet this demand is the object of all exploration. This has been met by the recorded results of my attainment of the pole. It is certified by the expert opinion of my own peers—the Arctic explorers of all the world.

Hollinger
pH 8.5
Mill Run F03-2193

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 029 708 050 7

Hollinger
pH 8.5
Mill Run F03-2193